

**THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL BOARD**

**In the Matter of:**

Sahara Market, LLC  
t/a Sahara Market

Application for Retailer Class B and  
Retailer Class CR License

at premises  
1901 Michigan Avenue, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20012

Case Nos.: 24-PRO-00075  
24-PRO-00076

License No.: ABRA-128673  
License No.: ABRA-128674

Order No.: 2024-594

**BEFORE:** Donovan Anderson, Chairperson  
James Short, Member  
Silas Grant, Member

**PARTIES:** Sahara Market, LLC t/a Sahara Market, Applicant  
  
Jeff Jackson, on behalf of Sahara Market, LLC t/a Sahara Market  
  
Prita Piekara, Chairperson, Advisory Neighborhood Commission  
5B, Protestant  
  
Charlotte Blount Lewis, President, Queens Chapel Civic  
Association, Protestant

---

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO DISMISS**

---

Sahara Market, LLC t/a Sahara Market, filed an application for a new Retailer’s Class B license (ABCA License No. 128673) and an application for a new Retailer’s Class CR license (ABCA License No. 128674). Both applications were protested by the Advisory Neighborhood Association (ANC) 5B and the Queens Chapel Civic Association (QCCA). The QCCA filed a motion to dismiss on the grounds that the Applicant failed to properly complete the designated representative form, and the claim that the Applicant cannot operate an off-premise and on-premise business at the same location.

The Board denies the motion because the QCCA does not have standing to challenge another party’s representation. Furthermore, mere errors in the submission of the designated representative form are not sufficient to render the representative’s actions null and void. Moreover, the Board is satisfied that the Applicant’s representative is authorized to represent the Applicant.

The Board further denies the motion because two licenses owned by the same operator are permitted to operate at the same location. As noted in the conflict-of-interest statute, an on-premise license holder may hold an off-premise license. D.C. Code § 25-303(a)(2), (2A), (3). Moreover, the regulations have long recognized that a business may hold multiple licenses at the same location. 23 DCMR §§ 212.3, 212.5 (West Supp. 2024) (authorizing a hotel licensee to hold a nightclub license as well and authorizing a grocery store to hold an off-premise and on-premise license at the same location). The Board further notes that the law barring the consumption of alcohol at an off-premise licensee is worded in such a way that it only bars the consumption of closed containers bought by the consumer and not the consumption of open containers served by any on-site restaurant, tavern, or nightclub. As such this argument is without merit.

### **ORDER**

For these reasons, the Board does hereby, this 28th day of August 2024, **DENIES** the motion to dismiss. Copies of this Order shall be sent to the Parties.

District of Columbia  
Alcoholic Beverage and Cannabis Board

eSigned via SeamalessDocs.com  
*Donovan Anderson*  
Key: ac43cb0b69d5f09e4b730603d1dccc8

---

Donovan Anderson, Chairperson

eSigned via SeamalessDocs.com  
*James Short*  
Key: 547ae3739229e6ac8d1b3323d2948ec

---

James Short, Member



---

Silas Grant, Jr., Member

Pursuant to 23 DCMR § 1719.1, any party adversely affected may file a Motion for Reconsideration of this decision within ten (10) days of service of this Order with the Alcoholic Beverage and Cannabis Administration, Reeves Center, 2000 14th Street, N.W., 400S, Washington, D.C. 20009.

Also, pursuant to section 11 of the District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act, Pub. L. 90-614, 82 Stat. 1209, District of Columbia Official Code § 2-510 (2001), and Rule 15 of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, any party adversely affected has the right to appeal this Order by filing a petition for review, within thirty (30) days of the date of service of this Order, with the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, 500 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. However, the timely filing of a Motion for Reconsideration pursuant to 23 DCMR § 1719.1 stays the time for filing a petition for review in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals until the Board rules on the motion. *See* D.C. App. Rule 15(b).

Finally, in the case of a summary suspension, “A person aggrieved by a final summary action may file an appeal in accordance with the procedures set forth in subchapter I of Chapter 5 of Title 2.” D.C. Code § 25-826(d).